

2026:PHHC:036372



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.70730 of 2025

Prbhjot Singh ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ... Respondent

1.	The date when the judgment is reserved	05.03.2026
2.	The date when the judgment is pronounced	10.03.2026
3.	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	10.03.2026
4.	Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or whether the full judgment is pronounced	Full
5.	The delay, if any, of the pronouncement of full judgment, and reasons thereof	Not applicable

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Deepak Singh Saini, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Himani Arora, DAG, Haryana,
for the respondent-State.

MANISHA BATRA, J.

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under

Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short



“BNSS”) seeking regular bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
376	14.06.2025	Shahabad, District Kurukshetra	103(1), 3(5), 61(2), 111(2), 111(3), 111(5), 238 and 253 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNS”) and 25 and 27 of Arms Act, 1959

2. Brief facts of the case relevant for the purpose of disposal of this petition are that the aforementioned FIR has been registered on the basis of complaint submitted by the complainant Prince alleging that he was working as a driver with the liquor contractor Shantanu from the last one month. On the evening of 13.06.2025, he along with Aniket, another employee of the liquor vend and Shantanu was going towards Shahbad. He had stopped his vehicle at Meena Market, Shahbad on asking of Shantanu. The latter had alighted from the vehicle and was proceeding towards a shop to buy cigarette, when suddenly two youths reached from behind, on a motorbike and one of them started firing shots upon him. Seeing them, the complainant hit both of them with his vehicle due to which the assailants also sustained injuries and fled while leaving their motorbike at the spot. The injured Shantanu was rushed to hospital who succumbed to the injuries and died. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated.

3. As per the further allegations, on 14.06.2025, a post was posted on Instagram App of one Noni Rana gang thereby claiming responsibility of murder of the victim Shantanu. The names of Lawrance Bishnoi, Jitender Maan, Rajan Jaat, Noni Rana and Kala Rana were also written on the said post. The accused Rajan Jaat who was in custody in some other case was

2026:PHHC:036372



joined into investigation of this case and suffered disclosure statement on the basis of which Subham Khurana and some other persons were nominated as accused. The accused Subham Khurana was also arrested. As per his disclosure statement, the accused Noni Rana had told him that the weapons and motorcycle for the murder of the victim Shantanu will be arranged by three friends of co-accused Badal Heer, one of whom was the present petitioner.

4. The petitioner was arrested on 23.06.2025. It was revealed that he was a member of Noni Rana gang and had played an active role in planning and carrying out the murder of the victim Shantanu. A motorcycle stolen by co-accused Romil Vohra had been taken from Dera Bassi by the petitioner and the co-accused Anas and had left at the shop of co-accused Mohit to change its colour and prepare fake number plates. As per further allegations, on 10.06.2025, on instructions of co-accused Badal Heer, the petitioner along with the co-accused Vansh Rana and Devender Singh had brought the abovesaid motorcycle with fake number plates and provided the same along with two pistols to the actual assailants. The call detail records of cell phone of the petitioner and co-accused had been collected which revealed that he had conversation with accused Vansh Rana and Anas during the relevant period. Some footages of CCTV camera were also collected showing him while taking away the stolen motorbike. Investigation now stands completed.

5. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of disclosure statement of

2026:PHHC:036372



the co-accused, which cannot be considered to be admissible in evidence. He was not named in the FIR. He is a poor truck driver who has been targeted by local police due to inimical relations. No recovery has been effected from him. He is in custody since long. No useful purpose would be served by his continued detention. The co-accused Mohit Kumar and Dipender Pal Singh, have been extended benefit of bail. His case is at parity with the case of co-accused Dipender Pal Singh and hence, he too deserves to be extended the same benefit. It is, therefore, argued that the petition deserves to be allowed.

6. Per contra, learned Deputy Advocate General, Haryana has argued that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature as in pursuance of a conspiracy hatched by the members of the party of gangsters Noni Rana to extort money from liquor contractors and to eliminate the victim, he had worked as a conduit and had facilitated change of colour of stolen motorbike, preparation of false and fabricated number plates and providing the same along with firearms to the co-accused for the purpose of committing murder of the victim. He, by being, member of an organized crime, facilitated commission of offence of murder of the victim. Some of the co-accused are absconding and yet to be arrested. There are chances of absconding of the petitioner as well or of intimidating the material witnesses, if extended benefit of bail. It is, thus, argued that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

7. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

8. The petitioner is alleged to be a member of a gang consisting of

co-accused who are part of an organized crime syndicate. As per the role

2026:PHHC:036372



attributed to him, on instructions of co-accused Noni Rana and Badal Heer, he along with co-accused Anas had brought the stolen motorbike from Dera Bassi, had left it at the shop of co-accused Mohit to change its colour and prepare fake number plates and had provided the said bike and two pistols to the co-accused for committing murder of the victim. His role is limited to facilitating firearms and motor bike and is distinct from principal homicidal act. He was not named in the FIR. The linkage sought to be established between the petitioner and the act of supply of arms and motorbike, primarily rests on disclosure statements of co-accused and himself and circumstantial inferences. The role so attributed to him is that of a conduit or facilitator in the purported procurement of arms/vehicle which is distinct and remote offence from the direct commission of offence punishable under Section 103(1) of BNS. It is also a matter of evidence as to whether the provisions of Section 111 are attracted or not? This Court is conscious that the provision is serious, however, in the present purposes, the Court must test whether the material against the petitioner justifies continued pre trial incarceration bearing nature of evidence and progress of the trial. Some call detail records of the cell phone of the petitioner and the co-accused have been collected by the investigating agency. However, there is no transcript of the same. As such, this is a matter best left for trial whether the burden of proof and standard of evidence shall be applied rigorously. The petitioner is in custody since 23.06.2025. In view of the foregoing discussion, particularly the limited role as prescribed to the petitioner, this Court is of



the considered opinion that the continued detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal as well as surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/CJM/Duty Magistrate concerned and subject to the following conditions:-

- (i) he shall appear before the learned trial Court on each date of hearing unless exempted.
- (ii) he shall not tamper with evidence or attempt to influence witnesses in any manner.
- (iii) he shall not leave the country without prior permission of the Court.

9. It is made clear that any observation made herein above is only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.

10.03.2026
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No